

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 \* \* \*

4 RAYMOND GARCIA, as a member, and on  
5 behalf of CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC  
6 EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION; CLARK  
7 COUNTY PUBLIC EMPLOYEES  
8 ASSOCIATION dba NEVADA SERVICE  
9 EMPLOYEES UNION aka SEIU 1107, a non-  
10 profit cooperative corporation,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL  
14 UNION, a nonprofit cooperative corporation;  
15 LUISA BLUE, in her official capacity as  
16 trustee; MARY K. HENRY, in her official  
17 capacity as Union President; EXECUTIVE  
18 BOARD OF THE NEVADA SERVICE  
19 EMPLOYEES UNION, in official capacity;  
20 STEVE URY, individually; DOES; and ROE  
21 CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01340-APG-NJK

**ORDER DENYING EX PARTE MOTION  
FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING  
ORDER**

(ECF No. 14)

23 The plaintiff has filed an “ex parte application for temporary restraining order on an order  
24 shortening time.” ECF No. 14. The motion is defective for several reasons. First, it is titled an “ex  
25 parte” motion even though it was served upon the defendants. *See* Local Rule IA 7-2(a) (“Ex Parte  
26 Defined. An ex parte motion or application is a motion or application that is filed with the court but  
27 is not served on the opposing or other parties.”).

28 More problematic, the “ex parte motion” is a nearly identical copy of the motion for  
preliminary injunction, with only a few new words and sentences scattered throughout. Thus, the  
new motion is moot because the motion for preliminary injunction is pending.

Finally, the plaintiff previously requested that I resolve his motion for preliminary  
injunction on an expedited basis. ECF No. 11. Despite having a very busy court schedule, I granted  
that request, imposed a shortened briefing schedule, and set the motion for hearing on the morning

1 of June 7, 2017. In his new motion, the plaintiff fails to explain why that June 7 hearing date is too  
2 distant. *See* Local Rule IA6-1(d) (“Motions to shorten time will be granted only upon an attorney  
3 or party’s declaration describing the circumstances claimed to constitute good cause to justify  
4 shortening of time.”). Because the plaintiff has not offered any reason to further shorten the briefing  
5 and hearing schedule on the preliminary injunction motion, I deny his motion for a temporary  
6 restraining order.

7 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order  
8 **(ECF No. 14) is DENIED.**

9 Dated: May 26, 2017.

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 ANDREW P. GORDON  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28